

### ***Remarks***

#### ***Support for the Amendments***

The amendments to claims 57, 72, 75, 76, 77 and 79 have been made to correct inadvertent typographical errors and to update the dependency of these claims. Support for the amendments to claim 55 can be found throughout the specification. Support for new claims 80-100 can be found throughout the specification. Specifically, support for new claims 80-85 can be found at page 23, line 21 through page 24, line 12; at page 26, lines 8-24; and at page 31, line 11 through page 34, line 16. Support for new claims 86-97 can be found at page 34, line 18 through page 40, line 11 and throughout Examples 1-9. Support for new claims 98-100 can be found at page 43, lines 7-23. Therefore, these amendments do not add new matter, and their entry and consideration are respectfully requested.

#### ***Status of the Claims***

By the foregoing amendments, claims 55, 57, 72, 75, 76, 77 and 79 are sought to be amended, claims 62, 65, 66 and 71 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer thereto, and new claims 80-100 are sought to be added. Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 55-61, 63, 64, 67-70, and 72-100 are pending in the application, with claims 55, 80, 86, 89, and 90 being the independent claims. Claims 55-70 have been allowed.

#### ***Summary of the Office Action***

In the Office Action dated October 21, 2003, the Examiner has made two rejections of the claims. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

In the Office Action at page 2, the Examiner has rejected claims 71-79 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failure to comply with the written description requirement. Moreover, the Examiner contends that the limitation "wherein said amino acid is not methylglycine and is not dimethylglycine" is not supported by the original specification and is therefore, new matter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, solely to expedite prosecution, and not in acquiescence to this rejection, claim 71 has been canceled, and claims 72-79 have been amended to no longer depend from this claim. Thus, this rejection has been rendered moot.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

In the Office Action at page 3, the Examiner has rejected claims 71-79 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly being anticipated by Chamberlin *et al.* (WO 95/20682; hereinafter "Chamberlin"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, solely to expedite prosecution, and not in acquiescence to this rejection, claim 71 has been canceled, and claims 72-79 have been amended to no longer depend from this claim. Thus, this rejection has been rendered moot.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to

the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert W. Esmond  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 32,893

Date: March 22, 2004

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600